REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 20, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Grant is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites a method of managing user connection sessions with a gateway wherein user status information is stored in a table in a separate RADIUS server during times that an authenticated user session is established with the gateway. After a failure of the gateway, it sends a request to the RADIUS server to provide the user status information and user data corresponding to each user in the table. The user data is re-stored on said gateway so that the gateway routes user traffic to continue the authenticated user session in response to the user data and the user status information without requiring re-authentication following the failure.

The final rejection correctly points out that while the preferred embodiment of Sitaraman has its AAA service implemented on the same machine as the protocol gateway, there could be other embodiments in which they are located on different machines. But the possibility of the components of Sitaraman being on two different machines does not lead to the conclusion that Sitaraman suggests the invention of claim 1. Rather, the fact that Sitaraman functions equivalently whether its two functions are on the same machine or on different machines is proof that Sitaraman is not performing the functions recited in claim 1 which can only be performed by two separate machines.

It is clear from claim 1 that an authenticated user session is established with the gateway based on user data stored in the gateway. At that time, user status information is also stored in the RADIUS server. Prior to a failure, the gateway routes user traffic in response to the user data. After a failure of the gateway in which the user data for routing traffic is lost, the user data is restored on the gateway from the RADIUS server to continue the authenticated user session without requiring re-

-2-
(Serial No. 10/054,103)

authentication following the failure. Whether or not Sitaraman uses one or two machines, nothing in its disclosure is suggestive of a redundant storage of user data for authenticated user sessions on another machine. Although Sitaraman backs-up information for a database of allocated IP addresses, this also is not suggestive of the claimed method of managing user connection sessions that stores user data on the gateway in response to authentication by the user and that stores user status in the RADIUS server because storage of an IP address allocation is insufficient to establish the information needed to continue an already authenticated session between the user and the gateway. In particular, nothing in Sitaraman suggests any method that would allow a gateway to continue an authenticated user session without requiring re-authentication following a failure of the gateway. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Regarding claim 5, the final rejection relies on login and accounting information of Sitaraman as disclosing a host object and a connection object. As is well known in the art, a connection object is a particular data object stored on a service selection gateway that provides a channel between the user and the service during a connection session (see specification - page 5, line 20 to page 6, line 11). The kind of login and accounting information disclosed in Sitaraman does not include all the necessary session data utilized in an SSG connection object, and there is no teaching or suggestion of this type of user data being stored on both the gateway and a separate RADIUS server in either Sitaraman or Grant. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable.

Regarding claim 6, the final rejection relies on the IP address database utilized in the IP address allocation system of Sitaraman. Nothing in Sitaraman or Grant is analogous to the delayed storage of user status until a connection object is created since Sitaraman fails to disclose any connection objects of the type recited in claims 5 and 6. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Grant and further in view of Zhang is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 depends from an allowable base claim and should likewise be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-7 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: June 14, 2005
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)